

Docket No: HAMANN  
Appl. No: 09/973,487

### REMARKS

The last Office Action of December 2, 2003, has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 16, 17 and 21 are pending in the application. Claims 8-15, 18-20 and 22 are withdrawn from consideration due to an earlier restriction/election requirement. Claims 1-4 and 7 have been amended. New claim 23 has been added. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee of \$18.00 for presenting one additional dependent claim in excess of twenty to Deposit Account No: 06-0502.

The specification was objected because of an informality, which has been corrected by amending section [0006] of the specification. A replacement paragraph [0006] is provided with this amendment.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 by replacing "magnetizable core" with -- pole core --, which is referred to in section [0007] (with reference to FIG. 3) and [0032] (with reference to FIG. 5) of the specification. No corrections in the drawings are required.

Claims 1-7, 16, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirement, and for being indefinite. This rejection has been

Docket No: HAMANN  
Appl. No: 09/973,487

addressed by amendments to claims 1 and 7, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 16, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) of FIGS. 1-3.

Claims 1-6, 16, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,968,912 to Shahamat et al.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 16, 17 and 21 as being anticipated by AAPA is hereby traversed and reconsideration of this rejection is hereby respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites an induction apparatus for use in an electric machine, which includes a pole core, a winding arrangement having a winding start and a winding end for inducing a magnetic field in the pole core in response to an electric current flowing through the winding arrangement, and a lossy, magnetizable device so interacting with the winding start and winding end of the winding arrangement that a magnetic flux is induced in the magnetizable device substantially only by a capacitive bypass current.

Applicant's prior art (FIGS. 1-3) shows a pole core 5 and a winding arrangement (indicated in FIG. 1 with the reference character "1"; also winding 7 in FIG. 3). However, AAPA fails to disclose the claimed lossy, magnetizable device shown in FIG. 4 with reference character "20". Those skilled in the art will notice

Docket No: HAMANN  
Appl. No: 09/973,487

that the "magnetic core 4" described in paragraph [0007] of the specification is typically referred to in the relevant art as "stator core" and is therefore entirely different from the "lossy, magnetizable device 20" depicted in FIG. 4. Applicant has amended claims 1-4 to more clearly recite the cooperation between the winding arrangement and the magnetizable core by particularly point out that the magnetizable core is not magnetized by the in-phase current that produces the magnetic field in the pole core, but substantially only magnetized by the capacitive bypass current that may flow only through one winding end portion (i.e., winding start or winding end) of the winding arrangement.

In particular, claim 3, as amended, now recites that the winding start and the winding end of the winding arrangement extend about the magnetizable device in opposite directions.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither AIPA neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 16, 17 and 21 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,968,912 to Shahamat et al. is hereby traversed and reconsideration of this rejection is hereby respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Claim 1 has been discussed *supra*.

Docket No: HAMANN  
Appl. No: 09/973,487

Shahamat shows a stator 18 that has slots carrying stator windings 22 and 24. The neutral end conductors of the windings extend through corresponding current transformers, one for each phase, that measure the stator current in each phase. The current transformers are provided for overcurrent and short-circuit detection. A measurement of the operating current is possible only if either the winding start or the wing end of the winding arrangement (but not both) extend through or around the current transformer. Shahamat's transformer is therefore entirely different from the lossy, magnetizable device disclosed in the instant application, which interacts with the winding start and winding end of the winding arrangement so that a magnetic flux is induced in the magnetizable device substantially only by a capacitive bypass current, and NOT, as in Shahamat's transformer, by the electric operating current (i.e., the current that flows through the winding arrangement and induces the magnetic field in the pole core). Accordingly, Shahamat's device would not be able to dampen the capacitive bypass currents, which is the object of the present invention.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Shahamat neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Docket No: HAMANN  
Appl. No: 09/973,487

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 31,084

Date: February 18, 2004  
350 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 4714  
New York, N.Y. 10118  
(212) 244-5500  
HMF/WS:af